DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 024 EA 001 828

By- Onofrio, John E.

The Public School Principal in Terms of Today's Leadership Role Expectations.

Pub Date 17 Sep 68

Note- 32p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.70

Descriptors- Administrator Role, Bibliographies, Decision Making, *Leadership, Leadership Qualities, Leadership Styles, *Principals, Problem Solving, *Public Schools, *Role Perception, *Theories

The role of the public school principal as it has evolved within the formal school organization is examined and compared with the needs and expectations held of him by himself and others. In addition, a theory of leadership is expounded and some concepts of leaders, leadership styles, and particular role expectations are discussed. A bibliography lists 31 books and articles. (HW)

N-X

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN TERMS OF TODAY'S LEADERSHIP ROLE EXPECTATIONS

ED025024

Presented
by

John E. Onofrio, Principal
Harry M. Bailey Junior High School
West Haven, Connecticut 06516

September 17, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 001 828

ED025024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	2
Some Definitions	2
Leadership	2
Initiating Structure	2
Leaders	2
Administrators	2
Roles	3
Role Expectations	3
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	5
Changing Concepts of Leadership	6
The Group Process Idea	7
A THEORY OF LEADERSHIP	8
Components of the Theory	9
Nature of Man	9
Nature of the Decision Making Process	10
Problem Solving	10
Nature of Leadership	11
The Leader	11
An Application	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
VARIOUS CONCEPTS OF LEADERS	13
Personal Traits Theory	13
Situational Theory	14
LEADERSHIP STYLES	15
Charismatic	16
Authoritarian	16
Therapeutic	16
ROLE EXPECTATIONS	18
A CONTRARY OPINION	19
A CLIMATE OF LEADERSHIP	20
CONCLUSIONS	22
FOOTNOTES	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27

INTRODUCTION

Phenomenal interest has been generated in recent years over studies in leadership. Researchers and practitioners evidence a growing awareness not only about leadership but also with leadership behavior. More specifically in the field of public education attention is being given to school administrators and their influence upon the shaping of our country's destiny. In most cases one immediately identifies the superintendent without question as a school leader within the community. Yet, the association of leadership with the role of the principal is not consciously identified that readily. The school principal, whether he is administrator of an elementary or secondary institution, who more often than not is engulfed by a labyrinth of managerial tasks, is particularly concerned and in some cases confused about his place in today's complex leadership vortex.

The Problem

A question can naturally arise in the mind of the typical administrator who normally does not consider himself a vital cog in the leadership frame of reference: How should the public school principal be viewed in terms of today's leadership role expectations? This study will seek a solution to the problem through an analysis of the principal's role as it has evolved within the formal school organization in comparison with the needs and expectations held of him by himself and others. Such development of the topic, however, would

be incomplete if the study were to ignore a theory of leadership, some concepts of leaders, leadership styles, and particular role expectations.

Some Definitions

In order to adequately treat this complex behavioral problem it is necessary to examine briefly some definitions of terms which will help to enlighten various avenues of approach to its solution.

An up to date and representative definition of leadership is developed by John K. Hemphill who perceives it as, "the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives, or for changing an organization's goals and objectives."[2]

It follows that initiating structure refers to "the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the group and in endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting a job done."[3]

Administrators utilize or maintain existing structures or procedures in order to attain organizational goals. Obviously, from the definition of terms, leader and administrator should not be confused with one another. Leaders are disruptive to the status quo and they affect change, whereas administrators act as a stabilizing force within the organization. It is unfortunate that many studies cited in this report confuse the terms leadership and administration with one another.[4]

Roles on the other hand may be technically defined as "the important analytical and conceptual units of the sociological dimension of organization." They are dynamic facets of the positions, offices, and statuses within an institution.[5] Furthermore, they define the behavior, obligations, and responsible expectations of the incumbents or actors. For the purposes of this study, however, the term "actor" will apply only to the supervising principal of a public school. The principal's normative obligations and responsibilities are termed his role expectations.[6]

The complexity of this leadership definition and others to follow indicates to some small measure implications for the school administrator, that his job has taken on new dimensions which perhaps were not even conceived a few years ago. It would be well to survey the effects of American history upon the leadership concept in order to better understand the present problem.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

History demonstrates that the leadership idea which dominates contemporary thought had its germination in the dawn of the American system, a time when imaginative and creative power influenced educational opportunity. It is unfortunate that most men who proposed great ideas were lost to posterity, since their personal identities dissipated with their groups. However, some men who were heard and remembered are: Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and Thomas Galloudet. Their leadership produced at least three guiding

principles which can be claimed for our educational value system:

1. Maintenance of the political health of democracy.
2. Opportunity for each child to reach self-fulfillment.
3. Maintenance and strengthening of religious and ethical values.

No doubt a major goal of educational leadership in the early days was the improvement of the literacy rate because of the importance for one to read and interpret the Bible. Moreover, the need for an educated electorate also spurred the accomplishment of this end. Each individual would then have a right to attain self-fulfillment through the implementation of an educational system which proposes these values.[7] School administrators, moreover, did not have to possess or employ any great skill beyond their authoritarian discipline and teaching competencies in order to maintain their positions.

Americans, during the long interim period from the establishment of this heritage until the Twentieth Century, had a firm commitment to universal education and the spread of literacy. However, they were too busy with the task of empire building and problems of economic and industrial growth to give heed to major changes and improvements needed in the schools. Educational leadership was forced to take a secondary stand in light of these other "more important" elements in the nation's growth. Meanwhile, within the past fifty years, a tremendous evolution of manners, morals, economic life, and educational challenges and opportunities emerged.

The affect of these evolutionary changes upon leadership gave rise to the employment of the professional manager who often had no financial hold on the enterprise. Important studies were also conducted to meet the new challenges, such as the one by Elton Mayo and his colleagues, which hinted at new ways to increase industrial production apart from the old hierarchy of autocratic management. Implications of these and similar findings were later adopted by the educational world which became convinced that cooperative, creative, and democratic leadership could be an effective and efficient approach.[8] Moreover, with the growing competency of teaching personnel, their share in school decisions gradually grew in proportion to their increased proficiencies.

Changing Concepts of Leadership

Interestingly enough, the changing definition of leadership in the last three decades, more than any other fact within this duration, illustrates its progress and broadened dimensions.

(1928) "Leadership (or leader) is an individual who is moving in a particular direction and who succeeds in inducing others to follow him."[9] William H. Crowley

(1935) "Leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which by successful interplay of relevant difference, controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause."[10] Paul Pigors

(1950) "Viewed in relation to the individual, leadership is not an attribute of personality, but a quality of his role within a specified social system. Viewed in relation to his group, leadership is a quality of its structure."[11] Cecil A. Gibb

(1966) "The activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable." [12] Ordway Tead

(1966) "A complex social phenomenon that cannot be treated meaningfully apart from related situational factors." [13] Andrew Halpin

Halpin's definition, which complements Hemphill's, suggests that in order to understand leadership in the Sixties one must not bypass the social, economic, and psychological behavioral and environmental forces that stimulate men to act either individually or in groups. This statement in lieu of a forthright definition indicates the complexity of the leadership phenomenon. Another author, John Bellows, calls the entire complex of factors that mends individuals into teams and prompts them to assign power to a leader, the leadership syndrome.[14]

The Group Process Idea

An outgrowth of history is that leadership has become a cooperative group process, especially within the world of public school education. Furthermore, if anyone connected with the work of the schools is to reflect this notion of leadership as a group process, he should be free to voice his views, knowing full well that they will be respected and, if good enough, be accepted. The shift is away from the kind of arbitrary administrative leadership formerly associated with the authoritarian practices of yesterday's principal but not away from his traditional responsibility to his staff. Certainly one cannot deny the authority also that emenates

from the entire staff working together. There is a definite trend toward the democratic sharing of his responsibility by all within his command while there is a corresponding tendency away from making the principal the recipient of all responsibility.[15]

A THEORY OF LEADERSHIP

Instrumental among philanthropic organizations that are seeking refinements of the leadership process that Halpin, Bellows, and others describe, is the Kellogg Foundation. Its subsidized studies, amounting to over ten million dollars, are now reaping results. One outgrowth is a theory of pragmatic value that will be useful in determining the extent to which a principal should exercise leadership in the democratic performance of his tasks and in decision making.[16]

Certainly, no one would deny that leadership is an essential quality necessary to directing followers toward goals. The school principal who must seek to improve and enrich the school's educational programs may employ the leadership process to facilitate the acquisition of this prime objective.

Leadership may be performed by a status number, the principal, or his teacher group member(s).[17] At the stage of implementation, the improvement of instruction should be made by those necessarily involved in the curriculum, the teachers. Basically, then, a sound philosophy would indicate that the responsibility for making decisions should rest in the hands of participants affected by the

decision. Cooperative group action or team work is the decisive force needed to meet these educational goals. Respect for people should also permeate all relationships and consideration given to their disposition.

Those greatest acted upon by the decision, the followers, should acquire an innate desire to see the improvement become a reality. This, researchers find, requires a continuous re-examination of educational objectives by principals and their staffs because of dynamics of and changing nature of society. The emerging theory should provide for an interaction of lay and professional people as well, not only to determine their end objectives, but also their means to fulfillment.

A theory of leadership can simply be stated as: "That action or behavior among individuals and groups which causes both the individual and the groups to move toward educational goals that are increasingly mutually acceptable to them."[18]

Components of the Theory

A school principal who works within the scope of the leadership theory becomes an instrument for change, involvement, and efficiency. However, in order to accomplish this he must explore the theory's components so that he may acquire a more complete understanding and thereby prompt a greater degree of its effect.

Major subdivisions or concept factors within the overall theory may be reduced to:

1. The nature of man
2. The nature of the decision making process
3. Problem solving
4. The nature of leadership
5. The leader[19]

The Nature of Man

It is a democratic value inherent in our American tradition that the dignity and worth of the human person is a right to be cherished and guaranteed. Everyone also has a right to identify, seek self-recognition, and solve problems relative to his own well being and disposition. Correspondingly, one has a duty to strive for occupational effectiveness.[20]

The Nature of the Decision Making Process

On the other hand, social relationships are paramount to the discussion of the decision making process. Ideally, decisions should emanate from the group immediately involved (teachers, lay persons, etc.) rather than from the principal. In reality, however, this is not always possible because of the policy ordinances or strict behavioral regulations imposed by superiors that may bind the authority person. Yet, participants in decision making very often demonstrate that they can act cooperatively in an effective manner, especially when the solution affects the quality of

education within the community and their job. The local school can become the fundamental agency for its own self-improvement.[21]

Problem Solving

Principles for educational leadership can be rendered ineffective without a method for establishing the present conditions in a school program used for defining educational goals and for systematically moving toward these goals. Problem solving can be reduced to an application of the scientific method designed and implemented by those involved. This provides greater impact for instructional improvement than research conducted by outside sources.[22]

The Nature of Leadership

The nature of leadership is such that each member has within the limits of his capacity, contributions he can offer the total group.[23] Evidently, even if the principal has a wealth of experience and intelligence, his decisions are not likely to be effective until they become group decisions. The principal can work through his staff and community groups by fostering this mutuality or teamwork concept, in arriving at a pattern of leadership. Goals of democratic control should be within his reach once he approaches decision making and problem solving through group involvement.[24]

Perhaps it can truly be said that within this schema the nature of the leadership process de-emphasizes the leader while

at the same time it emphasizes leadership. Paradoxically, as the school administrator attempts to create an atmosphere of mutual stimulation, even with the individual differences of those with whom he is to work, he must help to direct their exhuberant human energies toward a common goal. His task is no less diminished when he utilizes this process to the fullest, however by using it, he has enhanced both the method and the desired end.[25]

The Leader

One who leads must of necessity engage in an act to initiate structure in interaction as part of solving mutual problems.[26]

Halpin finds that educational administrators tend to be rated high by teachers and other principals in consideration, but not on initiating structure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of mutual trust, warmth, and respect in relationships between the principal and teachers. Yet, he finds that the most productive principals are those who rate high in both consideration and especially high on initiating structure. Yet, a caution can be noted that the principal who wishes to encourage innovation in his school should reflect upon his behavior as leader of his faculty, students, and the community at large.[27]

An Application

A pertinent and interesting sampling was made in the junior high schools of Michigan which sought to measure the degree to which innovations in the schools was associated with administrative

leadership. Some highly revealing conclusions were reached which are now considered to be classic dimensions of highly innovative principals. They are the following:

1. The principal clearly defines his role and lets his followers know what is to be expected.
2. The principal exhibits foresight and accurately predicts outcomes.
3. The principal speaks out and acts as a representative of his group.
4. The principal maintains a closely knit organization and resolves inter-member conflicts.
5. The principal uses persuasion and argument convincingly.
6. The principal regards the comfort, well being, status, and contribution of his followers.[28]

Of singular importance, the Michigan study found that teachers often look up to their administrator not just as a manager but as a leader who can prognosticate to some extent. They, consequently, will be more likely to make suggestions for curriculum changes under the security that he can guide them with accuracy.[29]

With this succinct explanation of a theory of leadership, it is clear that the democratic framework in which the principal works, and the demands society imposes, make his leadership role very important. The degree to which he will lead depends upon his unique job situation and the needs expectations of those who hold him accountable for enhancing and strengthening the instructional program. However, in an attempt to conceptualize

leadership, the principal - leader can emerge as a consequence of the needs of his group and the nature of situation in which the group attempts to operate.[30]

VARIOUS CONCEPTS OF LEADERS

The ideas proposed thus far about the principal working into a leadership role would not only have been unimportant but also entirely foreign to administrative studies by most authorities a quarter of a century ago or 10 years ago. Up to that time it was assumed that leaders were either born into the role or were products of situations that demanded leadership.[31]

Personal Traits Theory

The personal qualities or traits approach to leadership maintains that all leaders are born not made. Regardless of the situation, leaders emerge because of some innate personal characteristics such as forcefulness, intelligence, etc., that are part of their individual makeup. This concept, however, has much to be desired because, even though some traits are common to all leaders, they may also be characteristics held by non leaders as well. Ordway Tead proposes some very fine traits which he feels are akin to leadership qualities, but these are the types which it is desired that all citizens possess. Since leadership in one set of circumstances may not be effective in another, Clarence Weber proposes that it is highly unlikely that one is born with all the necessary qualifications for an immediate claim to leadership.

Moreover, groups and their goals differ in so many ways that various modes of action are necessary to achieve these goals.[32]

Situational Theory

If the personal qualities theory met disaster in terms of recent discoveries, so did its antithesis, the situational theory which likewise met an untimely death. Proponents of leadership through situational chance feel that unknowns will rise to the occasion in times of stress to meet the demand.[33]

Kenneth D. Benne labels both theories as myths especially since claiming that one must not wait for the world to give us a leader while the other view supposes that social situations automatically produce the required leadership. Naturally, sundry situations may demand a variety of leadership types. Yet, of far more importance, a leader must adjust his methods to the situation.[34]

Although the theories in and by themselves are disproved, they do give rise to the consensus that the situation, followers, and leaders all have bearing on the leadership process. Evidence suggests that further exploration is needed of a leader's personality and disposition in order to understand the leadership process, and the principal's role as a change agent. This, too, should be related to the personality of his followers. These variables ought then be referred to the characteristics of the situation. Ultimately, it is the principal who must determine his

status, not the job or the social setting, although both do play important parts in his role definition and the decision making process.

LEADERSHIP STYLES

An ever present danger is for the school principal to consider himself not the ship's captain, but its mechanic; not a leader, but solely a managerial administrator. Unfortunately, though, the daily duties he must perform in the realm of improving curriculum, supervising, evaluating, staffing, checking student progress, guiding, recording, reporting, discipling, and relating to the public as well as those within the school hierarchy, consume a great deal of his time. When he allows these tasks to overwhelm him and he becomes totally absorbed into the nomothetic context with little or no attention to the idiographic or personal element, his role is reduced to mechanical formulas. The personal elements of his philosophical convictions can be thwarted, and as a result, very little leadership style can grow.

However, when the principal considers himself a man of conviction, he then reflects a style, ever if done unconsciously.[35] He is a model of some style, as others perceive him. For the sake of simplicity authors have reduced these styles to three basic types the semantics of which differ from study to study. However, the following are symbolic of them all: charismatic, authoritarian, and therapeutic.[36]

Charismatic

The charismatic leader is primarily interested in focusing attention on himself. "I am valuable to myself and for what I am," is his credo. He is typed by a narcissism or Freudian self-love complex which may cause others either to admire and identify with his self-sustained quality or shy away from him because they consider him vain and exhibitionistic.

Authoritarian

A second type, the authoritarian leader, claims power not through endowment but through his office. He may be personally insecure. His motto is, "I am valuable because of my position and the power - authority attached to it." Some followers find solace in the clear cut goals and conventionality this type of principal may direct. However, they fail to see that he makes dependency too easy.[37]

Therapeutic

Finally, a third style is the therapeutic or altruistic principal who cannot make decisions without having an overwhelming dread that he may hurt someone's feelings. He over does democracy and fairness by making all decisions, group decisions, which are reached in committees and sub-committees. This type is indecisive, too hesitant, and too fearful that the role expectations imposed by his staff, school system, and community are inhibiting.[38]

Certain dangers also lurk in the actions of a therapeutic leader. Personal inadequacy may be the reason for his own inaction. If indecision characterizes most of his problems, his followers will inevitably become dissatisfied because they can perceive his weakness. Yet, despite these feelings, of the three kinds the therapeutic type more than the charismatic and authoritarian styles most exemplifies the democratic ideal. Generally, though, it is fortunate that principals are not often typed as one or the other, but by fragments of each type in varying degrees.

Moreover, a principal's leadership style is not too different from the kind of man he is personally, no matter what his situation. Each individual carries to the principalship a readiness foundation for the degree to which his leadership style can be developed.[39] His own depth of intelligence or lack of it, emotional stability, and self-esteem, set within the context of situational influences are the modifying elements that either enhance or destroy this foundation.

While on the job, his personal regard, feeling for others, and their subsequent regard for him, will all determine his role to a large extent. Likewise, if he initiates constructive innovation for improving the curriculum and instruction while at the same time he encourages his staff to try new and better ways of doing their tasks, his school will take on an aura of imaginative innovation. Contrarywise, if he fails to set the tone and decides

to wait for teachers to catch the zeal with which he is infected, he may fall prey to "sedentary-itis," a malady caused by sitting in chairs too long and too often. As principal of his school, he can fulfill his role of status leader, peer, discussion leader, and sometime, even the role of a follower. In all roles, he must set the tone that all staff members are perfectly free to question and offer alternative suggestions while he maintains a leadership image upon which all may focus when the need dictates.[40]

ROLE EXPECTATIONS

A possible conflict exists in the problem of reconciling the role or roles that others expect of the principal with the role his professional knowledge and conscience dictates.[41] Briefly, these expectations are imposed by the job, the staff, and the community. Job expectations of the principal center around the extent to which his personal skills, abilities, understandings, and values influence his leadership performance. It is of importance to note that within this context leadership is the adjective which modifies the leader's behavior. Within this scope, the principal will be evaluated on these plains:

1. The internal expectations, by his staff, parents, and neighbors.
2. The external - internal expectations, by his peers and supervisors.
3. The external expectations, by civic and professional groups.

Teacher expectations, in particular, condition the administrator's leadership style. As members of the school's personnel body, they seek: recognition, security, current information, equitable salary, opportunities for expression and development, treatment as humans with dignity, effective supervision and opportunity for advancement. Community internal-external expectations place an even greater demand on the principal insofar as it wants to be shown new approaches to school problems. Viewed as external expectations, civic minded and educated members of the community want to see more involvement of school personnel in the effects of social change.[42]

A CONTRARY OPINION

Not all authors are in agreement, however, that the movement toward democratic school leadership as outlined in this paper is the best method to fulfilling one's leadership role expectations. Strong opposition has been voiced by John Bartky whose criticism is directed at the "educational leadership cult."[43] Bartky calls it a cult which has its own standards of success and its own moral code of behavior. This cult is so group oriented that if principals ignore the commandments that govern its dynamics, they are accused of unethical practice. Furthermore, Bartky opinionates, the group feels that it is autonomous and is in no way obligated to social involvement, including its responsibility to the tax paying public. To make the matter worse, teacher

decisions may be in direct opposition to those made democratically by the public. Since the role of the principal is to serve the needs of his staff, he, the leader, is reduced to the role of a public servant. As a consequence of "forced conversion" to the precepts of educational leadership, school administration is becoming immobilized and the attainment of educational objectives is being jeopardized.

Even though Bartky's views may be considered a bit extreme, especially in view of the abundant literature that would disclaim him as a heretic, his cautions should not be neatly brushed aside and forgotten. Certainly, school leadership is fundamentally concerned with the nature, origin, use and control of nomothetic, organizational behavior. Yet it cannot ignore a compromise of the idiographic, teacher personalities, and the organization.

A CLIMATE OF LEADERSHIP

Effective leadership depends on the proper balance between the satisfaction of the teacher needs and a satisfaction of school needs. Neither the cultist leadership which is complete permissiveness nor the autocratic (as mentioned earlier) which makes followers dependent on the leader is entirely satisfactory. Reality leadership on the other hand is the answer. It utilizes the directive approach when the needs of the school are ignored, while it employs permissive techniques when needs of the individual

are not being met. One conclusion that can be gleaned out of this controversy is: leadership cannot assume a static position.[44]

The dynamic condition he does assume is called by the Joint project on the individual and the school a "Climate of Leadership."[45] What can he do in order to foster this climate? Fortunately, the answers are within his reach because the principal can affect school spirit, character, morale, and over riding purposes more than anyone else. Even though he may reflect the hope and professional beliefs of his personnel, his skill, spirit, values, and overall leadership will determine new horizons. He can lift the spirits of his associates as well as discourage their efforts. Poetically he can weave a cloth of his associates by planning, thinking and evaluating them. Moreover, he has an obligation to open doors and release the imagination of team mates thereby recognizing the special aptitudes, differences, and unique qualities possessed by everyone. His leadership will certainly be strengthened by recognition of the individual differences of those with which he works only if he builds upon this diversity a unity of common purpose. Someone once commented that the leader-principal casts a spell which encourages the teacher to become excited, to be professionally rewarded, and to gain satisfaction from a deep involvement in studying the problems inherent in teaching the individual child.[46]

CONCLUSIONS

The public school principal should be viewed and should view himself as an instrument of change and experimentation. Today's technological age certainly demands a never ending search for improvement. His most rewarding role is to help his teachers construct and support policies and goals, the evaluation of curriculum, the selection of instructional materials, school and class organizational structures, pupil groupings, pupil management, pupil opportunities, roles and responsibilities of various staff positions, and other aspects of the school's total complex. This is his role whether he wants to recognize it or not because of the expectations held of him which have grown out of staff, organizational, community, and nationwide conditions.

No one expects him to abandon completely his managerial administrative role to become a leader. This is an unrealistic expectation since the board of education and its agent, the superintendent, set policy which will determine to a large measure the latitude of freedom a principal may exercise. However, there is still a great margin of discretionary power which any principal has, if he will only take the time to seek it. It is within this sphere that our present age demands that he exercise greater directional leadership to the excellence public education deserves. No doubt the theory of leadership expounded in this report, concepts, styles, and role expectations all give rise to a new context in

which the principal now exists. He must rise to the occasion by using his own personal talents, education, and foresightedness to lead his staff, students, and community through the processes outlined heretofore, toward establishing a realistic, creative, and far-reaching climate for the improvement of instruction. Finally, if his behavior is characterized by both consideration for others and a tendency to initiate structure or bring order into a situation by planning and arranging the situation so that the work can go forward in a shared direction, he is assuming some degree of the leadership expectations his role today demands. The extent to which he will practice leadership will depend upon his personality, initiative, job complex, and use of the democratic process.

FOOTNOTES

1. James M. Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," National Society for the Study of Education, Yearbook, LXIII, Part II (1964), p. 119.

2. Ibid., p. 122.

3. Andrew W. Halpin, "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior," Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 170.

4. Lipham, op. cit., pp. 122-123.

5. Ibid., p. 120.

6. Roald F. Campbell, John F. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), p. 191.

7. Harold G. Shane, and Wilbur A. Yauch, Creative School Administration (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1954), p. 4.

8. Ibid., pp. 5-8.

9. William H. Crowley, "Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XXIII (1928), pp. 144-57.

10. Paul J. W. Pigors, Leadership and Domination (Boston: Houghton-Miflin Co., 1935), p. 105.

11. Cecil A. Gibb, "The Research Background of an Interaction Theory," Australian Journal of Psychology, XXVIII (1950), pp. 19-42.

12. Josiah Gilbert Holland, "The Leadership Concept," An Introduction to School Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 110.

13. Ibid.

14. Roger Bellows, Creative Leadership (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), p. IX.

15. Shane and Yauch, op. cit., pp. 12-14.

16. Robert L. Saunders, Ray E. Philips, and Harold T. Johnson, A Theory of Educational Leadership (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966), pp. V-VII.

17. Ibid., p. 39.

18. Ibid., p. 40.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., pp. 54-55.

21. Ibid., pp. 89-90.

22. Ibid., p. 114.

23. Clarence A. Weber, and Mary E. Weber, Fundamentals of Educational Leadership (New York: Exposition Press, 1961), p. 173.

24. Ibid., p. 28.

25. George M. Beal, Joe M. Bohlen, and J. Neil Randabough, Leadership and Dynamic Group Action (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1963), pp. 33-35.

26. Hemphill, op. cit., p. 98.

27. Halpin, op. cit., p. 171.

28. Jon Wayne Jacobs, "Leader Behavior of the Secondary School Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), pp. 13-15.

29. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

30. Irving Knickerbocker, "Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications," An Introduction to School Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, Inc., 1966), p. 120.

31. Weber and Weber, op. cit., p. 34.

32. Ibid., p. 35.

33. Ibid., p. 46.

34. Ibid., p. 48.

35. Don E. Homechek, "Leadership Styles, Decision Making, and the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1966), pp. 27-28.

36. Howard Guetzkow, editor, Groups, Leadership, and Men (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963), p. 163.

37. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

38. Ibid.

39. Willard Fox, and Alfred Schwartz, Managerial Guide for School Principals (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965), pp. 8-10.

40. Ellsworth Tompkins, "The Principal"s Role in School Improvement," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), pp. 2-3.

41. Roald F. Campbell, and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 116.

42. Fox and Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

43. A. John Bartky, "The Depressive State of Educational Leadership," An Introduction to School Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), pp. 54-55.

44. Ibid., p. 56.

45. Joint Project on the Individual and the School, A Climate for Individuality (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965), pp. 53-56.

46. Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bartky, John C., "The Depressive State of Educational Leadership," An Introduction to School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Bass, Bernard W., Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1960. 548 pp.

Beal, George M., Joe M. Bohlen, and J. Neil Randabough, Leadership and Dynamic Group Action. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1963. 365 pp.

Bellows, Roger, Creative Leadership. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961. 338 pp.

Campbell, Roald F., and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 547 pp.

Corbally, John E., Jr. and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966. 474 pp..

Fletcher, C. Scott, Education for Public Responsibility. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1961. 192 pp.

Fox, Willard, and Alfred Schwartz, Managerial Guide for School Principals. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1965. 146 pp.

Gardner, John W., Excellence. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962. 171 pp.

Guetzkow, Harold, editor, Groups, Leadership, and Men. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963. 293 pp.

Halpin, Andrew W., "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior," Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 547 pp.

Hemphill, John K., "Administration as Problem Solving," Administrative Theory in Education. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishers, Inc., 1958. 188 pp.

Holland, Josiah Gilbert, "The Leadership Concept," An Introduction to School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Jennings, Eugene, An Anatomy of Leadership, Princes, Heroes, and Superman. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. 256 pp.

Joint Project on the Individual and the School, A Climate for Individuality. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965. 56 pp.

Knickerbocker, Irving, "Leadership: A Concpetion and Some Implications," An Introduction to School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Lipham, James M., "Leadership and Administration," National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, LXIII (1964).

National Association of Secondary School Principals, Design for Leadership. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1964. 16 pp.

Pigors, Paul J. W., Leadership and Domination. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1935.

Redfern, George B., "Personnel Administration," School Executive's Guide. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Saunders, Robert L., Ray C. Philips, and Harold T. Johnson, A Theory of Educational Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1966. 174 pp.

Sears, Jesse B., The Nature of the Administrative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950. 623 pp.

Shane, Harold G., and Wilbur A. Yauch, Creative School Administration. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1954. 566 pp.

Weber, Clarence A., and Mary E. Weber, Fundamentals of Educational Leadership. New York: Exposition Press, 1961. 278 pp.

Williams, Stanley W., Educational Administration in Secondary Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964. 529 pp.

B. PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Crowley, William H., "Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XXIII (1928), 144-57.

Davison, Hugh M., and Richard R. Renner, "Discovering Leadership Guide Lines," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), 18-25.

Gibb, Cecil A., "The Research Background of an Interaction Theory of Leadership," Australian Journal of Psychology, XXVIII (1950), 19-42.

Homachek, Don E., "Leadership Styles, Decision Making, and the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1966), 26-31.

Jacobs, Jon Wayne, "Leader Behavior of the Secondary School Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), 13-17.

Tompkins, Ellsworth, "The Principal's Role in School Improvement," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), 1-4.